



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

light and shade, of earlier art". "The decadent art of the third and fourth centuries evolved new optic tendencies which give it an indisputable aesthetic importance, irrespective of origins". Such aesthetic ideas and theories Mrs. Strong applies to the individual monuments she discusses, so that her conclusions can scarcely be called her own. It is therefore difficult to criticise her attitude without attacking Wickhoff and Riegl, and that is beyond the scope of this review. Our author is furthermore much indebted, as she acknowledges on many occasions, to Petersen and von Domaszewski, although they are not members of the new school.

The book, as Mrs. Strong tells us in the preface, is "based upon a series of lectures delivered at different times during the last seven years", and we may well regret with the author that she has not had time to "recast it more completely, and that it must perforce exhibit the faults peculiar to popular lectures". The general make-up of the book is good, though it would have been far more convenient had it been bound in two volumes. The hundred and thirty plates contain some hundred and seventy excellent illustrations. Convenient is the comparative chronological table (by centuries) of the emperors, also the genealogical trees of Augustus, Octavia, Trajan and the Antonines, and finally of the Emesene dynasty. Of the forty-five misprints noted, some are rather annoying, especially the incorrect references to plates and the incorrect page references in the index. On p. 6 the reference to the Temple of Athena at Aegina should read Temple of Aphaia. Three times (pp. 71, 266, 375) the National Museum at Athens is referred to by its old name, the Central Museum.

The book begins with the Augustan age, some forty pages being fittingly devoted to the Ara Pacis. From Augustus to Nero Roman works of sculpture are rare; so our author discusses two silver cups from Bosco Reale in the Rothschild collection, and the Augustan cameos in Vienna and Paris, though to my mind these are Graeco-Roman and do not come within the scope of this book. It would have been far more profitable to have discussed on p. 95, in connection with the rare works of art from the reign of Tiberius, the statues of Eumachia and of Concordia Augusta, found in the building of Eumachia at Pompeii (Mau-Kelsey, p. 438, fig. 245), for they belong without doubt to the period of Tiberius. The next two chapters deal with the reliefs of the Flavian age, and we are surprised to read on p. 105 that "of actual sculpture from the reign of Vespasian we possess but scanty traces, if any", for we do possess important reliefs on the altar in the court of the Temple of Vespasian at Pompeii (Mau-Kelsey, p. 107, fig. 43), reliefs which we know were made during the reign of Vespasian. It is indeed

remarkable how persistently Mrs. Strong neglects Pompeii. To be sure, it is not to be expected that a book which must necessarily have fixed limits should deal with all the monuments of the Roman period, but we have a right to look for the *characteristic* examples of the various periods. Four chapters, about one-fifth of the entire book, are devoted to Trajanic sculpture, including a valuable and fascinating description of the reliefs on the column of Trajan. To Hadrian is justly devoted less than one-half the space given to Trajan. The author would have done well had she omitted the section on the Antinous type, a product of Graeco-Roman art. Her unrestrained praise in this connection is unwarranted. The Antonine period is of great importance for the history of Roman art, though one would not realize it from reading the book under review. Mrs. Strong should have laid more stress on the architectural ornamentation of the temples at Baalbek (Heliopolis) in Syria, and especially on the magnificent Aurelian reliefs recently discovered at Ephesos, to which is devoted only one page. Because these reliefs are so little known is all the more reason that they should have been discussed in detail—but not even one reproduction is given. The art from Severus to Diocletian, and the monuments of the principate of Constantine receive their due, and in the last chapter is given a rather hasty account of Roman portraiture from Augustus to Constantine. With the exception of this last chapter on portraiture there are but few references to sculpture in the round, by far the greater part of the book being devoted to Roman reliefs¹.

YALE UNIVERSITY

PAUL BAUR

SUMMARY

Certain excavations made last spring by the German Institute in Athens, under the direction of Professor Dörpfeld, are of great importance and considerable general interest. A brief account of them was published in June in pamphlet form supplementary to the first number of volume 32 of the *Athenische Mitteilungen*. The investigations were made on three sites, Tiryns, Olympia, and Pylos.

At Tiryns, in pursuance of the policy now uni-

¹ This work is reviewed somewhat unfavorably, by Charles De Kay, in the *Saturday Times Review* for August 3 last. Mr. De Kay's paper is labeled *An Apologist for Roman Sculpture*. There are two columns of general remarks about Greco-Roman art, most of which does not touch the book under review at all. The statement is then made that Mrs. Strong "hurts her case very often by claiming too much for works that are cold and clumsy, poorly disposed, and lacking in true distinction. The reliefs on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius are examples in point. Immensely valuable as documents, they are very inferior as works of art, and the same thing may be said of a great many reliefs which survive on the triumphal arches of Titus, Trajan and Constantine". The "review" is illustrated by a cut of Commodus as Hercules, and another of the *Mondragone Antinous*. The insertion of the latter cut is interesting in view of Professor Baur's remarks on the Antinous type. It is pleasant to turn from such a "review" to the earnest remarks of the reviewer of the first volume of Mr. Russell Sturgis' *History of Architecture*, in *The Evening Post* for July 20 last: the writer warmly champions the claims of Roman art to the adjective "original". C. K.

versally advocated if not always followed, and in continuation of similar work on the site begun in 1905, an attempt was made to reach the original surface of the ground by pits sunk under the present palace at various points. The attempt was most successful. Under the great propylon of the Mycenaean palace remains of an older building were found, including its gateway; the walls of the gateway were still standing to a height of three metres. In another part of the palace five stone graves were discovered under walls of the older building, and under the graves again two distinct earlier periods of occupation were proved by walls and potsherds. One well-preserved skeleton and two monochrome vases were found in the graves. Outside of the southeast corner of the citadel a large deposit of clay figures, vases and other clay objects belonging to the post-Mycenaean time came to light. Dörpfeld explains them as coming from the temple which was built on the site of the megaron after the Mycenaean palace was burned. Other discoveries of geometric vases and objects of bronze and iron were made in graves between the citadel and the modern railroad station. This work is to be continued next spring.

The work at Olympia was inspired by the same motive, namely the search for possible deposits below the level of the present sanctuary. Under the Pelopion were found layers of deposits from different ages, which contained sherds, clay figures and bronzes. The oldest stratum revealed many prehistoric monochrome sherds of the kind found by Dörpfeld in Leukas and regarded by him as the original pottery of the Achaeans. Similar sherds were uncovered in the lowest deposit beneath the Heraion, as well as other pieces on which geometric ornaments were painted in white on the varnish, as in the Kamares ware of Crete. The importance of this discovery is that it proves that the settlement on the site of the Olympian sanctuary dates back to very early times.

The discoveries at the third site are if possible even more interesting as they are concerned with the attempt to identify the Homeric palace and town of Nestor at Pylos. With this purpose in view Dörpfeld explored the vicinity around Samikon on the western coast of the Peloponnesus, and was so fortunate as to receive a clue from a peasant which resulted in the discovery of three Mycenaean tholos tombs under a low citadel. The tombs, though partially destroyed, were found to contain a great number of potsherds with characteristic Mycenaean decoration, gold and silver ornaments, amber beads, amethysts, lapis lazuli, many fragments of ivory and pieces of bone. The trenches sunk in the hill disclosed walls of a building, in a room of which stood several pitthoi containing figs.

The sherds, with the exception of six Mycenaean pieces, were all of the monochrome type found in Leukas and Olympia. Here then, exactly between Samikon and Lepreon, as reported by Strabo, on a hill 60 m. high, and a half-hour distant from the sea, Dörpfeld claims to have found the Pylos of Nestor. Further, he maintains that the original pottery of the Achaeans was not the Mycenaean, but the monochrome ware with incised decoration already mentioned. He intends to make further excavations here also during the coming spring.

BARNARD COLLEGE

THEODORE LESLIE SHEAR

NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

held its twenty-second meeting at the Hotel Marlborough on Saturday, December 7. The attendance was somewhat disappointing, especially in view of the interesting address that Professor C. P. Parker of Harvard delivered, on Latin Life through Latin Language. He started by quoting Professor Greenough's remarks that you could translate everything into Latin if you could get the proper point of view. Professor Parker paid his respects to Mr. Bennett's views on the Roman pronunciation of Latin, maintaining that we know enough about the Roman pronunciation to approximate it with sufficient accuracy to get a fair idea of how it must have sounded, and holding that the use of the Roman pronunciation is absolutely essential in order to obtain a proper appreciation of the Roman point of view, and that this point of view can not be gotten through the English pronunciation. He minimized Mr. Bennett's objection that very few professors of Latin, much less students, could write and pronounce Latin with due regard to quantity, by remarking with great truth that many people could pronounce with substantial correctness who could not mark the quantities if required to do so. It was impossible also, said Mr. Parker, to get the Roman point of view from courses in Roman archaeology and Roman life; such courses, at least as commonly conducted, give merely the facts of the outer life of the Romans and fail to give the real Roman spirit. It was likewise impossible to get any correct idea from such books as Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, because the picture of Epicureanism therein contained was entirely different from the picture that we get from Lucretius. No, the only way to obtain a proper appreciation of the Roman point of view was through study of Latin literature at first hand; when this is done we find that the Roman, with all his devotion to war and to the forum, was a dreamy, poetical, musical soul with a great capacity for pathos and a keen appreciation of the spiritual side of life. The Roman in despite of general opinion was tragic in the intensity of his emotions; further, his very love of